

Remarks/Arguments

The final Office Action dated October 13, 2010 (“Office Action”) indicates that claims 1-32 remain pending, that claims 1-6 and 11 stand rejected, and that claims 7-10 and 12-32 are allowed. Claims 1, 7, 11, 12, 20, 27, and 32 are independent.

No claims are amended in this response.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by O’Brien US 2002/0061062, hereinafter “O’Brien.” Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants’ independent claim 1 recites, in part, the features of “adding noise to at least one pixel in a picture in the video stream following decoding in an amount correlated to additive noise of pixels in at least one prior picture.” Emphasis added. Applicants respectfully assert that O’Brien does not disclose such features.

In the Response to Arguments section on page 2, the Office Action alleges that O’Brien’s difference in hue for the selected and compared pixels is random fluctuation of error or undesired disturbance, and therefore is considered to be noise which will be removed by the system of O’Brien. Since some of the pixels are computed, the Office Action alleges that the difference in hue between the selected distorted pixels are computed, hence the random fluctuation of error or undesired disturbance is considered to be “noise.”

Furthermore, on page 4, the Office Action alleges that O’Brien, paragraphs 0053, 0054, discloses frame $i+1$ is applied with added noise of weighted corrected measures of RGB multiplied by $1/3$ of frame i or prior frame. The Office Action seems to suggest that this provides clarity of resolution and display which allegedly means that the signal received via broadcast networking medium was distorted by noise and distracting effects which will be removed by O’Brien’s system. Since some of the pixels are distorted, the difference in hue between the selected distorted pixels are computed, hence is allegedly considered noise.

Applicants respectfully assert that such teachings of O’Brien are completely different

from claim 1.

O'Brien, paragraphs 0053 and 0054 discloses statistical computation for RGB values in the nth pixel between frames i and i+1 is allegedly applied to established threshold RGB values. Weighted correction measures of the individual RGB values are allegedly determined wherein the computation of the weighted measures captures pixel RGB values in frame i to be contributed to the correction of given pixel in frame i+1. The Office Action appears to interpret O'Brien's difference in hue for the selected and compared pixels as random fluctuation of error or undesired disturbance, and therefore is considered to be noise which will be removed by the system of O'Brien.

However, O'Brien does not disclose the feature of adding noise to at least one pixel in a picture in a video stream as recited in claim 1. Assuming, arguendo, that the difference in hue for the selected and compared pixel is considered to be "noise," a position which Applicants do not agree with nor acquiesce to, O'Brien does not consider the difference in hue to be "noise" until after the computation and comparison against a threshold. In other words, if the difference in hue is within the threshold, then O'Brien does not appear to consider the difference in hue to be "noise." It is only when the hue is outside the threshold does O'Brien consider the difference to be "noise." Therefore, O'Brien cannot disclose the feature of adding noise to a pixel because the hue is not considered to be "noise" until after the computation and comparison; then if it is considered noise it is removed. O'Brien does not disclose the feature of adding noise to a pixel. Thus, O'Brien does not disclose every feature of claim 1 and as such, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection.

Furthermore, O'Brien does not disclose the feature of "decoding in an amount correlated to additive noise of pixels in at least one prior picture."

The Office Action, page 4, alleges that the signal received via a broadcast networking medium was distorted by noise which will be removed by the system of O'Brien. Because the noise is removed by O'Brien's system, O'Brien cannot disclose decoding in an amount correlated to additive noise of pixels in at least one prior picture. If O'Brien's system removes the noise from the pixel, then there is no noise of pixels in prior pictures to be added and correlated. Therefore, O'Brien's system cannot correlate additive noise of pixels in at least

one prior picture. Thus, O'Brien does not disclose every element of claim 1, and the 102 rejection should respectfully be withdrawn.

Independent claim 11 differs from claim 1 and requires consideration and interpretation on its own merits. However, claim 11 includes similar patentable features of claim 1 as discussed above. For example, claim 11 recites in part: "adding noise to at least one pixel in a picture in the video stream following decoding in an amount correlated to additive noise of at least one other pixel in the picture."

Applicants apply the above arguments for claim 1 with respect to independent claim 11. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is allowable over O'Brien and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 2-4 depend from allowable claim 1 and incorporate the features of claim 1. Furthermore, claims 2-4 include additional distinguishing features. Applicants apply the above arguments from claim 1 to each of dependent claims 2-4. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2-4 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable parent claim. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over O'Brien in view of Childers et al. US 5,210,836, "Childers." Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from allowable claim 1 and incorporate the features of claim 1. Furthermore, claims 5 and 6 include additional distinguishing features. The Office Action has cited Childers to show the amount of noise is correlated using an instantiation of a Finite Infinite Response (FIR) filter. However, Childers does not show or suggest "adding noise to at least one pixel in a picture in the video stream following decoding in an amount correlated to additive noise of pixels in at least one prior picture" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Childers does not cure the deficiencies of O'Brien with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, the

Office Action does not rely on Childers for disclosing or suggesting the feature of adding noise to at least one pixel in a picture in the video stream following decoding in an amount correlated to additive noise of pixels in at least one prior picture. Therefore, the combination of O'Brien and Childers does not suggest every feature of claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6820 to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

No fees are believed due with regard to this Amendment. However, if there is a fee, please charge the fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **07-0832**.

Respectfully submitted,
Carl L. Christensen et al.

By: /Robert B. Levy/
Robert B. Levy, Attorney
Reg. No. 28,234
Phone (609) 734-6820

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312